



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/936,918

11/01/2001

Sinpei Nakata

KAS-157

3025

24956

7590

02/12/2009

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

1800 DIAGONAL ROAD

SUITE 370

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ALEXANDER, LYLE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte SINPEI NAKATA,
TAKEHIKO YOTSUGI and HIROAKI ISHIZAWA

Application No. 09/936,918
Technology Center 1700

Mailed: February 12, 2009

Before PAMELA S. BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal*.
BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on January 29, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, GROUNDS OF REJECTION

A review of the file reveals that the Examiner's Answer mailed September 4, 2008 sets forth a new ground of rejection of claims 1-3, 6 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritchie et al. (USP 6,022,746) [page 3]. However, while it is noted that Carbonari et al. (USP 5,730,938) is included at the top of page 4 in the discussion of this rejection, and was included in the "Evidence Relied Upon" also appearing on page 4, it was not included in the statement of the rejection. Clarification is required.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the application be returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to issue a PTOL-90 clarifying the record as to whether Carbonari et al. should have been included in the statement of the 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 6 and 8-12; and
- 2) for such other further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

PSB

Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Road
Suite 370
Alexandria, VA 22314